



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/742,342	12/19/2003	Venkatesan Srinivasan	RAG-005	6424
7590	07/12/2007		EXAMINER	
William L. Botjer			THERIAULT, STEVEN B	
PO Box 478				
Center Moriches, NY 11934			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2179	
			MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			07/12/2007	PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	10/742,342	SRINIVASAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Steven B. Theriault	Art Unit 2179	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 20 April 2007.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-12 and 24-26 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 13-23 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-12 and 24-26 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 19 December 2003 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ . |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ . |

DETAILED ACTION

1. This action is responsive to the following communications: Non-provisional application filed 12/19/2003.
2. Claims 1-26 are pending in the case. Claims 1, 12, 13, and 24 are the independent claims.

Election/Restrictions

3. Claims 13-23 are withdrawn from further consideration pursuant to 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a nonelected invention, there being no allowable generic or linking claim. Applicant timely traversed the restriction (election) requirement in the reply filed on 04/20/2007.

Applicant's election with traverse of Group II in the reply filed on 04/20/2007 is acknowledged. The traversal is on the ground(s) that Group I was a process and Group II was the product for using the process. This is not found persuasive because of two reasons as set forth: 1) The previous Examiner required that the applicant to distinctly and specifically point out supposed errors in the restriction requirement (See page 3, bottom). In response, the Applicant's arguments revolve around the issues of searching specific classifications of the art and that the separate prosecution of the other method claims is unnecessary and a wasteful use of resources. The present Examiner finds that claims in Group 1 are the method claims and Group II are the system claims and can find no other method claims as the application suggests. Further, one and only one invention is allowed per application as stipulated by MPEP 37 CFR 1.141. Finally, the applicant has provided no evidence in the response as to why the restriction under 806.05(j) was improper procedurally.

2) The current Examiner finds that the Applicant has not presented any evidence to state why the previous Examiners finding to the contrary that Group II and I are not related to two distinct inventions. Group I is directed to a process and Group II is directed to a system for which the execution of the process can occur. Group II was held restricted from the application because the process as outlined in Group 1 can be have a materially different design, mode of operation,

Art Unit: 2179

function or effect for which the system as claimed is used. The Examiner has attached several references in form 892, where a process of modeling business inputs within an interface does not specifically require the scope of claims 13-23. For example, picking claim 14 as a representative claim for the group, the claims requires a web server, an administration tool, a message service module, and a security service module. The process steps of Group 1, could be accomplished with a system such as 6,957,417 and 20060064666 that provide interfaces for modeling metadata that describe modeling interfaces that do not require a web server, or an admin tool or a security service module, as recited in the withdrawn claims. Therefore, the present Examiner holds that the requirement is still deemed proper and is therefore made FINAL.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Specification

4. The specification is objected to as failing to provide proper antecedent basis for the claimed subject matter. See 37 CFR 1.75(d)(1) and MPEP § 608.01(o). Correction of the following is required: The computer program product and computer readable medium recited in claims 24-26 are not explicitly defined within the specification and lacks antecedent basis in the specification" *so that the meaning of the terms in the claims may be ascertainable by reference to the description*" (See 1.58(a)). The Examiner has searched the present application specification to find the specific terms and cannot find an explicit mention in the specification. Perhaps the applicant can amend the claims to reflect the system as defined in the specification.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

5. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter, which the applicant regards as his invention.

Regarding claim 1, the phrase " flowchart like manner" renders the claim(s) indefinite because the claim(s) include(s) elements not actually disclosed (those encompassed by "or the like"), thereby rendering the scope of the claim(s) unascertainable. See MPEP § 2173.05(d).

6. **Claims 1-12 and 24-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C 102(e) as being anticipated by Gilboa et al (hereinafter Gilboa) U.S. Patent Pub 2004/0148586 A1 published Nov. 12, 2003.**

Please note that the effective filing date of Gilboa has been analyzed and found to be Nov. 14, 2002. Provisional application 60/426,097 and 60/479,017 have been thoroughly reviewed and their disclosures fully describe the same invention as disclosed by Gilboa in US. Patent Application Publication 2004/0148586 A1, thus the earliest filing date of Nov. 14, 2002 is appropriate.

In regard to **Independent claim 1**, Gilboa teaches a method for enabling an application designer to develop user interfaces (UIs) by modeling without coding (Para 0009), the method comprising the steps of:

- a. Identifying the requirements of the UI as processes, the application designer identifying the processes (See Para 0057 and 0144). Gilboa teaches gathering user requirements.
- b. Defining the tasks that are required to define the identified processes, the tasks being defined by providing meta data to the instances of a set of pre-built reusable components, each pre-built reusable component being an abstract object built to perform a function (See 0021, 0063 and Para 150) Gilboa teaches the user interface model that uses components described in metadata and the tasks within the processes are specified by the user interaction with the interface. A scenario or scene are provided with specific components (See Para 0083 and 0089) and provide for activities to be performed by the user while using the interface (See 0082).
- c. Connecting the tasks in a logical order to model the processes, the tasks being connected in a flowchart like manner (See Figure 11a and Para 0072-0074 and 0091-0094)
- d. Storing the data related to the tasks and the overall process for the developed UI in a database (See Para 140) Gilboa teaches the information is stored in the repository.

With respect to **dependent claim 2**, Gilboa teaches the method wherein the step of identifying the processes comprises the steps of:

- Identifying the processes required to develop the UI screens (See Para 0148).
- Identifying the processes required to develop the application controller for the UI (See 0150- 0151).

With respect to **dependent claim 3**, Gilboa teaches the method wherein the step of defining the tasks comprises the steps of:

- a. Defining the tasks that are required to define the processes that are required to develop the UI screens comprising (See Para 0144).
 - i. Defining the tasks for placing controls on the UI screens (Para 0162).
 - ii. Defining the tasks for mapping of database fields to the screen variables (Para 0147).
 - iii. Defining the tasks for validating the user actions at the control level and at the screen level (Para 0148).
 - iv. Defining the tasks for forwarding the screen information to the application controller (Para 0163) and defining the tasks that are required to define the processes that are required to develop the application controller for the UI (Para 0164).

With respect to **dependent claim 4**, Gilboa teaches the method wherein the step of defining the tasks comprises the steps of:

- a. selecting the components that are required to define the identified tasks (See Para 0144).
- b. Defining the tasks, the tasks being defined by specifying meta-data for the selected components, the meta-data being process specific properties which when associated with a component defines the corresponding task (See Para 0150 and 0163 - 0165).

With respect to **dependent claim 5**, Gilboa teaches the method wherein the step of

interconnecting the tasks comprises the steps of:

- a. defining at least one Rule (Para 0099)
- b. specifying a task to be referred to in case of success of the Rule and specifying a task to be referred to in case of failure of the Rule (See Para 0113)

With respect to **dependent claim 6**, Gilboa teaches the method wherein the step of interconnecting the tasks comprises the step of connecting the tasks serially (See Para 0083).

With respect to **dependent claim 7**, Gilboa teaches the method further comprises the step of enabling the application designer to visually verify the developed UI, the verification comprising the steps of:

adding a plurality of breakpoints in the UI process and validating the UI process till the first breakpoint and presenting the results of verification to the application designer and verifying the remaining part of the UI process (Para 0069 and 0148).

With respect to **dependent claim 8**, Gilboa teaches the method wherein the step of verifying the UI is performed until the next breakpoint in the UI (See Para 0069).

With respect to **dependent claim 9**, Gilboa teaches the method, wherein the step of verifying the UI is performed for the remaining part of the UI ignoring the breakpoints (See Para 0069 and 0148)

With respect to **dependent claim 10**, Gilboa teaches the method wherein verifying the UI is performed task by task for the remaining part of the U (See Para 0069 and 0148).

With respect to **dependent claim 11**, Gilboa teaches the method further comprises the step of enabling a user to execute the developed UI, the execution comprising the steps of:

- a. inputting a request to be processed, the request being input by a user (See Para 0144)
- b. Transferring the request to an Engine for processing (Para 0143).
- c. Identifying the components required to process the user's request (See Para 0145).
- d. Caching the identified components (Para 0171)

Art Unit: 2179

- e. executing the tasks in a logical order as defined in the UI process (Para 0180).
- f. Handling the errors that occur while processing the request, if errors occur in any of the above steps (See Para 0099 and 0113).
- g. Logging the information related to the execution of the tasks in a database (See Para 0140).
- h. Outputting the results of the execution (See Para 0167).

In regard to **Independent claim 12**, Gilboa teaches a method for enabling an application designer to develop User Interfaces (UIs) by modeling without coding, the method comprising the steps of:

- a. Identifying the processes that are required to model the UI screens, the application designer identifying the processes (See Para 0144).
- b. Identifying the processes that are required to develop the application controller for the UI (See Para 0145).
- C. Identifying the tasks that are required to define the identified processes, the tasks being defined using a set of pre-built reusable components, each pre-built reusable component being an abstract object built to perform a function (See Para 0146).
- d. Defining a plurality of Rules and specifying a task to be referred to in case of the success of each Rule and specifying a task to be referred to in case of a failure of each Rule (See Para 0099, 0113 and 0117).
- g. Interconnecting the tasks serially (See Para 0083).
- h. Visually verifying the developed UI (Para 0069 and 0148).
- i. Storing the data related to the developed UI in a database (See Para 140) Gilboa teaches the information is stored in the repository.

In regard to **Claims 24-26**, claims 24-26 reflect the computer program product comprising computer readable instructions for performing the steps of method claims 1, 7, and 11, respectively, and are rejected along the same rationale.

Art Unit: 2179

It is noted that any citation to specific pages, columns, lines, or figures in the prior art references and any interpretation of the references should not be considered to be limiting in any way. A reference is relevant for all it contains and may be relied upon for all that it would have reasonably suggested to one having ordinary skill in the art. In re Heck, 699 F.2d 1331, 1332-33, 216 USPQ 1038, 1039 (Fed. Cir. 1983) (quoting In re Lemelson, 397 F.2d 1006, 1009, 158 USPQ 275, 277 (CCPA 1968)).

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Steven B. Theriault whose telephone number is (571) 272-5867. The examiner can normally be reached on M, W, F 10:00AM - 8:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Weilun Lo can be reached on (571) 272-4847. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

SBT



WEILUN LO
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER